



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,071	08/30/2006	Marc Van Loon	3732	6173
7590 Striker Striker & Stenby 103 East Neck Road Huntington, NY 11743				
			EXAMINER ZENATI, AMAL S	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/28/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/591,071

Applicant(s)

VAN LOON ET AL.

Examiner

AMAL ZENATI

Art Unit

2614

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. **Claims 1 - 2, and 5 - 11**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Fuhrmann et al (US Patent No.: 6,347,218 B1; hereinafter Fuhrmann)** in view of **Hargis David (Patent No.: Wo0205610; hereinafter David, IDS filed on August 30, 2006)**

Consider **claim 1**, **Fuhrmann** clearly shows and discloses a discussion unit (10) for use in a conference system, wherein the discussion unit (10) is adapted to be connected to at least one second discussion unit (10), wherein the discussion unit (10) comprises an essentially closed casing (410) and at least one exchangeable portion (420) is configured as at least one closed rim (422) that is removably mounted to the closed casing (410) (abstract; fig. 1 and fig. 3; col. 3, lines 24-50; and col. 4, lines 15-21); however, **Fuhrmann** does not disclose the method, wherein consisting of a hollow only circumferentially closed rim (422) that is removably mounted to cover only a circumferential edge (424) of the closed casing (410).

In the same field of endeavor, **David** clearly discloses the method, wherein consisting of a hollow only circumferentially closed rim (422) that is removably mounted to cover only a circumferential edge (424) of the closed casing (410) (abstract; and page3, lines 1-19).

David discloses the above for the purpose of providing means to a display device of an electronics unit to be viewed by using a removable frame as to cover only a circumferential edge (page 3, lines 1-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a removable frame that cover only a circumferential edge as taught by David in Fuhrmann, in order to provide means to a display device of an electronics unit to be viewed by using a removable frame as to cover only a circumferential edge (page 3, lines 1-4).

Consider **claim 2, Fuhrmann and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), The discussion unit (10) according to the preceding claim, wherein the exchangeable portion (420) covers an outer ring-like portion of a surface of an outside part (424, 412) of the closed casing (410) (David: page3, lines 1-19; and fig).

Consider **claim 5, Fuhrmann and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein the casing (410) comprises at least one operating panel (412), the operating panel (412) having at least one panel base (414) and at least one operating element (416), wherein the panel base (414) is at least partially surrounded by the rim (422) on its circumferential edge (fig. 1, labels: 4 and 6; and col. 2, lines 53-67).

Consider **claim 6, Fuhrmann and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein the at least one exchangeable portion (420) is mounted to the closed casing (410) by at least on interconnection (426), the at least one interconnection (426) comprising at least one of the following: a form-fit interconnection; a force-fit interconnection (426), preferably a snap- on mounting and/or a snap-hook (428) and/or a catch (438) (fig. 1, labels: 12, 13, and 14).

Consider **claim 7, Fuhrmann and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein the closed casing (410) comprises at least one first section (452) and at least one second section (454), the at least one first section (452) and the at least one second section (454) being adapted to be attached to each other, wherein the at least one interconnection (426) is inaccessible from the outside of the casing (410) when the at least one first Section (452) and the at least one second section (454) are attached to each other (fig. 1, labels: 2, 6, 12, and 14).

Consider **claim 8, Fuhrmann and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein the at least one first section (452) and the at least one second section (454) are adapted to be attached to each other by means of screwing (fig. 1, labels: 13 and 4).

Consider **claim 9, Fuhrmann and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), an exchangeable portion (420) adapted to be used as the at least one exchangeable portion (420) in a discussion unit (10) (abstract).

Consider **claim 10, Fuhrmann and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein a set of exchangeable portions (420), the set comprising at least two exchangeable portions (420) according to the preceding claim, wherein at least two of the exchangeable portions (420) differ with regard to color and/or material (col. 1, lines 41-46).

Consider **claim 11, Fuhrmann and David** clearly show the discussion unit (10), wherein a conference system comprising at least two discussion units (10) according to one of the preceding claims referring to a discussion unit (10) (fig. 1; and col. 2, lines 45-51).

Response to Arguments

The present Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on June 01, 2010. **Claims 1, 2, 5 – 11** are now pending in the present application.

Applicant argues regarding the claim 1 on pages 7 - 9 of the Applicant's Response that "David's removable panel [110] is not an exchangeable portion (420) consisting of "a hollow only circumferentially closed rim" that is removably mounted to a closed casing (410) as part of a discussion unit "to cover only a circumferential edge" of the closed casing (410), as claimed."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument, Fuhrmann clearly shows in Figure 1 that the electronic device housing (1) has a closed casing since the external wall element (14) which at least partially covers the housing wall (5), the external wall has also the closed rim (abstract, and fig. 1). David teaches a removable framing an electronic unit/hollow only circumferentially closed rim (see fig 1). Moreover, Fuhrmann clearly shows in Figure 1 the rim 6 of the housing 1 is covered by the exchangeable external wall element (14) (figs.: 1 , 2, and 3; and col. 3, lines 24-50). Furthermore, Fuhrmann teaches at least one wall of the extreranal wall element overlies the portion of the housing (col. 6, lines 44-49) and Fuhrmann discloses a detachable external wall element adapted to overlie a protion of the husing, the external wall element being sized and shaped to at least partially cover the housing upon attachment thereto ("wall element being sized and shaped to at least partially cover the housing" could be at least one exchangeable portion (420) consisting of a hollow only circumferentially colsed rim) (col. 5, lines 47-50). Moreover, David teaches a removable framing an electronic unit/hollow only circumferentially closed rim (see fig 1, and page 2, lines 19-30) .Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a removable frame that cover only a circumferential edge as taught by David in Fuhrmann, since Fuhrmann also teaches the external wall element being sized and shaped to at least partially cover the housing upon attachment thereto.

Therefore, in view of the above reasons, Examiner maintains rejections.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amal Zenati whose telephone number is 571- 270- 1947. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on 571- 272- 7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571- 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/591,071
Art Unit: 2614

Page 7

/CURTIS KUNTZ/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

/Amal Zenati/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

June 23, 2010